

## **Questions Regarding the Clark County, NV Commercial & Public Institution Waste Diversion Project RFP**

1/Are there page limitations for either the narrative / technical proposal or the cost proposal?

*Answer 1- No. Both technical and cost submittals should be made on minimum 30% recycled-content paper and printed on both sides of the page.*

2/Concerning the narrative / technical proposal, the RFP does not appear to specify either requested or required elements for this portion of the overall submission, unless we have overlooked or misinterpreted one or more sections of the RFP. Please identify any requested or required elements for the narrative / technical proposal or reference the RFP section(s) where such elements are described.

*Answer 2- the technical proposal should address all subsections 3.1 through 3.9 of Section 3 Scope of Work of the RFP. If a vendor believes a task(s) identified in this section of the RFP will not or cannot be performed, the proposal must clearly state this and provide explanation of the perceived issues concerning the task(s).*

3/Concerning the Scope of Work we request clarification on the following items:

a/For Tasks 3.1 and 3.2, can you give some guidance as to how many public sector and private sector recycling programs outside of and in Clark County are to be profiled? Task 3.2 lists 8 locations as a minimum number within Clark County. How many more are desired? Also, guidance would be appreciated on the split between public sector and private sector sites for both tasks.

*Answer 3a- USEPA contact has identified at least four (4) programs to use as program models from outside Clark County. NDEP does not know if these programs are conducted at public or private facilities. Representatives of agencies located in the public buildings identified in subsection 3.2 have agreed to allow the awarded vendor to come to their facility and characterize the existing recycling programs. There is no requirement to characterize any more Clark County public building recycling programs, however; as this is viewed by the NDEP as a basic and fairly non-complex task, we would encourage the awarded vendor to make a good-faith effort in identifying and characterizing additional public building programs, particularly if the additional recycling program used a different service provider. There has not been contact with any*

*private sector recycling programs and it is recognized that private facilities maybe unwilling to allow access and characterization of their recycling programs. NDEP believes that three (3) private sector programs can be identified that will permit the awarded vendor the required access to their facilities to satisfactorily perform this task, although a good-faith effort by the vendor to identify and describe more than three (3) private/commercial sites is expected.*

b/Task 3.3 involves, in part, compiling information on for – profit and non – profit entities that provide recycling services for governmental, institutional, and commercial generators in Clark County. This information would then be made available to potential participants in the project program. There is also the phrase “...if appropriate, contact larger regional companies to encourage the expansion of commercial recycling in Clark County.” Is the reference to “larger regional companies” here a reference to generators or service providers? What would be the criteria for determining whether such contact is appropriate? Can there be more explanation of what is intended here?

*Answer 3b- NDEP is aware that there are several private businesses located in Clark County that are engaged in the collection and marketing of waste paper. Similarly there are several businesses also engaged in the collection and marketing of scrap metals. Subsection 3.3 requests the awarded vendor to familiarize themselves and describe the current system for collection of recyclables in Clark County through interviews and discussions with the existing recyclers and to identify any potential for expansion of that system to additional commodities or new markets. For example, contact with a larger regional company might be appropriate if market prices for certain plastic resins would make collection and recycling of that commodity profitable. NDEP believes that the recyclers in the private sector are best able to determine what is and isn't profitable; therefore if there are other barriers besides market values that are hindering the collection and marketing of any recyclable commodity, those barriers should be identified and described.*

c/Task 3.3 also says to “work with service providers to develop a method for tracking recycling efforts, preferably by weight.” Is that to be done with all the service providers identified under Task 3.3 or with those service providers who are involved with the final group of program participants?

*Answer 3c- USEPA required that some measurability be built in to this project and suggested the quantities of recyclables collected in the programs to be studied before and after the project be used to satisfy this requirement. NDEP*

*stated that it was unclear if the recycling service providers were currently weighing recyclables in all programs. USEPA suggested that if weights or weight estimates were not currently being measured in a program, the awarded vendor would work with the recycling program manager to establish such measurements.*

d/Task 3.4 says a minimum of 40 public and private sector sites should be identified as a pool of potential participants for the proposed project. Task 3.5 says waste audits are to be performed at the 25 most promising sites to determine program implementation steps and requirements. Should we assume there will be a joint NDEP / contractor evaluation to select those 25 sites, that they will be the focus of the project program, and the sites not selected will not be involved in the project program?

*Answer 3d- NDEP and USEPA would like the opportunity to provide input on the selection of the twenty-five (25) targeted generators. Whether this takes the form of a formal evaluation committee or not is something that can be addressed in the vendor's proposal or decided following the contract award. The generator sites identified as part of the task in subsection 3.4, but not selected for more in-depth assessment as part of subsection 3.5, are to receive the outreach and education materials developed in this project and some assistance in implementing or expanding their recycling programs if they request it as a result of the outreach effort.*

e/Between Tasks 3.5 and 3.6 it seems there are possibly missing steps and those are linking generators with service providers that have no program and working on – site with representatives of existing programs to improve and expand them. What role does NDEP see for the consultant regarding those steps, or is that up to the proposer to define?

*Answer 3e- NDEP doesn't see a significant link between the tasks described in subsection 3.5 and subsection 3.6. The information necessary to complete the outreach and education materials described in subsection 3.6 should primarily come out of the work performed in subsection 3.4. The idea behind subsection 3.5 is to empirically define the materials potentially available to recyclers from commercial and public sector generators in Clark County. The idea behind subsection 3.6 is to provide commercial and public sector generators in Clark County with comprehensive, yet concise information as to how they can divert segments of their waste streams from landfill disposal.*

f/For Tasks 3.6 and 3.7, is the contractor budget supposed to cover the expenses for development, production, printing, and distribution of outreach and educational materials (Task 3.6) and the potential expenses involved with purchasing radio time, newspaper ad space, and use of other similar publicity outlets (Task 3.7)?

*Answer 3f- Development and publication of outreach and public education pamphlets or brochures is expected to be included in the awarded vendors budget. Some type of internet-friendly outreach and education materials are also expected. The use and re-printing of these materials by any interested public agency is also required. NDEP believes the quantity of educational materials printed under this contract can be relatively small, 1,000 brochures or pamphlets would be sufficient. Internet-friendly versions can be as simple as converting a word-processing created file to Adobe<sup>TM</sup> pdf format.*

*Additionally, NDEP does not expect any paid air time or newspaper space be incorporated in the contract budget, which is why subsection 3.7 of the RFP suggests press releases, distribution of the outreach materials to media outlets, and presentations at appropriate meetings and conferences held in Clark County as satisfactory deliverables for this task.*

4/What role and / or assistance is anticipated in the project on the part of personnel from NDEP, EPA, or public agencies in Clark County such as the Clark County Health District, Clark County government, incorporated cities, and others?

*NDEP and to a lesser extent USEPA personnel anticipate being a significant part of this project. The programs to be identified and characterized as part of the task in subsection 3.1 will be provided by USEPA. Entry to the public building recycling programs identified in subsection 3.2 has already been accomplished by NDEP. NDEP is prepared to suggest and introduce the awarded vendor to several commercial/private sector prospects to satisfy the completion of this task. NDEP has electronic files of approximately 90% of the private recycling service providers in Clark County. This resource should make the task in subsection 3.3 a relatively low allocation of manpower. Finally, NDEP is prepared to act as liaison or facilitator between the awarded vendor and a number of the public and private sector contacts in Clark County necessary to successfully complete this contract scope of work.*